

Interview Summary

Application N .

The amende

Examin r

Isis Ghali

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Art Unit

1615

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dr. Kishore G (primary examiner).

(3) Isis Ghali (jenior examiner).

(2) Mr. Thomas Barn (attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 August 2002 .

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: Claims of record .

Identification of prior art discussed: Prior art of record .

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The instant claimed thermoplastic resin sheet and its properties were discussed. The following were suggested:

- 1) to show that the prior art sheets do not have the same modulus;
- 2) to establish criticality of the amounts of the resin, the medial ingredients;
- 3) narrow the instant claimed modulus and drug, they are broad;
- 4) narrow the claims in term of specific polymers, specific drugs, and the nature of the sheet.

The amendment may or may not be entered since the application is after final.